GP-303047

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on January 13, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as previously presented are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 7-16, 18-20 and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,748,318 to Jones ("Jones") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,349 to Bullock et al. ("Bullock").

This rejection is respectfully traversed because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because he has not shown how Jones in view of Bullock teaches or suggests all of the elements of Claim 1.

Claim 1 includes the elements "the comparing including performing pattern recognition on the vehicle position data for the current trip and the vehicle position data for one or more previous trips; predicting a destination for said vehicle based on the results of the comparing; and suggesting a path to said predicted destination."

The Examiner does not point to either Jones or Bullock for teaching or suggesting the element "predicting a destination for said vehicle based on the results of the comparing", as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, the Examiner has not shown how Jones in view of Bullock teaches or suggests "predicting a destination for said vehicle based on the results of the comparing", as recited in Claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable.

For at least the reasons described above, Claim 1 is patentable over Jones in view of Bullock. Because they contain similar elements, Applicants submit that Claims 19 and 22 are also patentable over Jones in view of Bullock for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to Claim 1. Applicants also submit that Claims 7-16, 18 and 23 are patentable due to their dependency on Claim 1, and that Claim 20 is patentable due to its dependency on Claim 19.

2

GP-303047

Further, with regard to Claims 19 and 22, the Examiner states, on page 5 of the Office Action, that "comparing said vehicle position data for a current trip to vehicle position data for a previous trip to predict a destination for said vehicle (this portion is similar AS pending CLAIM 1(b)'S LIMITATION wherein Bullock et al. suggest about pattern recognition – see Bullock et al., claim 2); therefore similar rationales and reference set forth are applied)." The Examiner appears to be implying that Claim 2 of Bullock teaches "predicting a destination for said vehicle based on the results of the comparing."

Applicants disagree that Bullock teaches "predicting a destination for said vehicle based on the results of the comparing", as recited in Applicants' Claim 19. Claim 2 of Bullock recites "defining a navigation route between a starting location and a destination location, ... wherein the navigation route is defined by a user of the remote communications node ... wherein defining the navigation route comprises activating a route storing algorithm in the remote communications node, wherein the route storing algorithm defines the starting location and the destination location of the remote communications node."

Bullock is directed to compiling navigation route content (e.g., position data, velocity data, and time data) for use in creating optimal routes between a user defined starting location and destination location. This navigation route content compiled by Bullock may be used by the route creator and/or by other requestors to create optimal routes between the starting location and the destination location. Bullock teaches creating new routes between two defined locations by tracking a route traveled by a remote communications node (e.g., vehicle). The starting and stopping locations of the vehicle are compared to stored start locations and destination locations to see if they match (or are within a radius of) previously stored locations. If they match, then the route taken provides content about a new route between the locations or provides additional content about an existing route between the locations. A user of the remote communications node can also create a new set of starting location, destination location and route by activating a route setting algorithm which tracks the starting location, stopping location and route traveled by the vehicle. (See, for example Col. 6 line 58 – Col. 7 line 28 of Bullock). Bullock collects route content data for specified starting and stopping locations and does not teach or suggest "predicting a destination for said vehicle based on the results of the comparing; and suggesting a

3

GP-303047

<u>path to said predicted destination</u>" as recited in Claim 19.

Neither Jones nor Bullock, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "predicting a destination for said vehicle based on the results of the comparing; and suggesting a path to said predicted destination", as recited in Claim 19. Therefore, Claim 19 is patentable over Jones in view of Bullock at least because Jones in view of Bullock does not teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 19. Because it contains similar elements, Applicants submit that Claim 22 is also patentable over Jones in view of Bullock for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to Claim 19.

Claims 2-6, 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of Bullock and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,567,745 to Fuchs et al. ("Fuchs"). The Examiner has stated that the rationales and references for the rejection of Claim 1 are incorporated.

This rejection is respectfully traversed because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because he has not shown how Jones in view of Bullock and in further view of Fuchs teaches or suggests all of the elements of Claims 2-6, 17 and 21.

The addition of Fuchs does not cure the deficiencies of Jones and Bullock as described above with respect to Claims 1, 19 and 21. Because they depend from Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claims 2-6 and 17 are allowable for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to Claim 1. Because it depends from Claim 19, Applicants submit that Claim 21 is allowable at least for the reasons advance above with respect to Claim 19.

Conclusion

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that Claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

In the event the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment, Applicants' attorneys respectfully request the courtesy of a telephone conference.

4

GP-303047

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By

Anne Davis Barry
Registration No. 47,408

Date: May 15, 2006
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413

5